



ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20301

INTELLIGENCE

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

SUBJECT: The KIQ/KEP Program for FY 1975

Reference: (a) Your 29 May 1974 memorandum for the USIB and IRAC,
same subject
(b) Your 3 July 1974 memorandum for the USIB; Subject:
Draft Key Intelligence Questions for FY 1975
(c) Your 29 July 1974 memorandum for the USIB; Subject:
Revised Key Intelligence Questions for FY 1975

I have reviewed the progress and status of the Key Intelligence Question Evaluation Program as a result of receiving the three referenced memoranda. I am particularly interested in the use of this program, or a later version, to relate intelligence resources to intelligence substance and thus improve the effectiveness of our resource allocations. In addition, I fully support the related objective of improving intelligence products by using the KIQ and KEP. My review suggests that earlier DoD comments on the KIQ/KEP have not been adequately recognized.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense, in commenting on the initial KIQs, emphasized the importance of developing a short list of specific, factual questions, the answers to which would demonstrably impact major near term decisions. The FY 1975 KIQs provide a relatively long list of broad questions. I believe the current KIQs must be better focused if the objectives you established for the KIQ/KEP are to be met. I appreciate the difficulty of achieving a short, highly focused list that satisfies all the users. However, I believe it would be better to complete work during a year or two on a relatively small number of highly focused questions that could have an identifiable impact on major decisions, rather than simply providing additional information on a larger set of more general questions.

I am concerned about the lack of user participation in the KEP. Based on my understanding of current plans, the NIOs are the focal point for the KEP. In particular, the NIOs are responsible for preparing Section A of the KEP Baseline Report, which identifies deficiencies, and Section D of the Performance Report, which evaluates user satisfaction with the intelligence product. Thus, the NIO is put in the position of evaluating his own performance. Without detailed user inputs to the KEP, it is unlikely that much of value will be achieved. I should emphasize that in my view neither the NIOs nor the USIB nor the NSCIC adequately represent the users. Instead of having the intelligence community tasking and evaluating itself, I suggest that the NIOs work directly with the users in the preparation of the KEP reports. I recognize that this will require more time on the part of the NIOs, but believe this is necessary to achieve your objectives even if it requires an increase in the staff of the NIO.

I believe that the NIOs and the other people working on the KEP in DIA and the IC Staff are doing their best to make the evaluation process work in a way that will achieve your objectives. I understand they have had many bureaucratic problems tending to take the teeth out of the evaluation process. We should support their desire to quantify the evaluation process so that it could eventually prove useful for resource decisions, as well as product improvement. In particular, more focused questions and more user participation are needed for the KIQ/KEP to be useful to measure intelligence community performance and allocate resources.

Albert C. Hall